REMARKS

Pending Claims

New claims 41-46 have been added. No claims have been canceled. Claims 1-25, 30, 33 and 34-37 were canceled by prior amendment. Accordingly, claims 26-29, 31-32 and 38-46 are currently pending in this application. Claims 26, 31, 38 and 41 are independent. The original filing fee covers the number of claims now pending. A Request for Continued Examination and the required fee accompany this paper.

Request for Suspension of Action under 37 CFR § 1.103(c)

A Request for Suspension of Action under 37 CFR § 1.103(c) for a period of three months and the required fee accompany this paper.

35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Earl et al., US Pat. No. 6,112,228 (hereafter "Earl"). Claims 27 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Earl in view of Dutta et al., US Pat. Appl. Pub. No. 2003/0020966 (hereafter "Dutta"). Claims 28, 29, 32, 33, 39 and 40 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Earl in view of Dutta, and further in view of Abdelaziz et al., Pat. Appl. Pub. No. 2003/0041141 (hereafter "Abdelaziz"). Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 USC

13

§103(a) as being unpatentable over Earl in view of Schmitt, US Pat. No. 5,768,524

(hereafter "Schmitt"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, and request

reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for the following reasons.

Discussion of Independent Claims 26, 31 and 38

The present invention, as set forth in independent claim 26, includes that

"said one or more devices and said second program are not disclosed to said first

computer."

In the rejection of claim 26, the Office Action asserts at page 2, line 21, that

Earl teaches that the one or more devices and the second program is not disclosed

to the first computer, citing col. 4, lines 13-23 of Earl. However, this portion of Earl

reads as follows:

> Functionally, <u>the proxy server 230 receives a data request from the browser 220</u> and, if the client is authorized to access information from the particular web site, the proxy server attempts to fulfill that request locally, e.g., from data stored in memory 104 configured as a "cache". <u>If it cannot satisfy the request, the proxy server forwards the request over the network to the appropriate web server 110</u>. The server then responds by transferring a stream of data to the proxy server, which stores and forwards the data onto the browser application 220. It should be noted that the proxy server may also be configured to run on a server computer 120.

Presumably, the Office Action is equating Earl's proxy server 230 to Applicants'

management computer storing the first program, and Earl's web server to

Applicants' one or more devices storing the second program. Thus, under Earl, the

browser 220 on the client is used to request data from a website using a URL of the

web server from which the data is being requested. Therefore, Earl's client must

know the location (i.e., the URL) of the website server, since the URL of that website

server is used to request the data.

Earl merely teaches that the proxy server intercepts a request for data made

from the client to the web server 110. If the proxy server has already stored the

requested data, the proxy server responds in place of the web server. However, if

the proxy server does not already have the requested data stored, the proxy server

forwards the original request to the URL specified in the original request in order to

obtain the requested data.

As also discussed at col. 5, lines 49-64 of Earl, the browser 220 requests the

original HTML document at a particular URL and the proxy server forwards the

request over the Internet to the web site server. At flow 406, the proxy server 230

receives the original document from the server 110 and stores ("caches") a copy of

that document. Thus, in Earl it is clear that the client is fully aware of the existence

and the location of the web site server from which the data is being requested, even

though the request is intercepted by the proxy server. Accordingly, Earl fails to

teach or suggest that "said one or more devices and said second program are not

disclosed to said first computer, a recited in Applicants' claim 26.

Applicants' claim 26 further includes that

said one or more devices receive said second request, execute said
second program and send the execution results to said management

computer without disclosure to the first computer of said one or more devices or said second program.

At page 3, line 15 of the Office Action, it is asserted that this limitation is taught by Earl at col. 5, line 65 through col. 6, line 11. However, as pointed out above, Earl's browser 220 requests the original HTML document <u>at a particular URL</u> and the proxy server <u>forwards the request</u> over the Internet to the web site server. The proxy server 230 receives the original document from the server 110 and stores ("caches") a copy of that document (col. 5, lines 55-60). Furthermore, even when the browser requests an HTML document already saved on the proxy sever, the browser is still using the URL of the original website server, and not that of proxy server (col. 5, line 49 through col. 6, line 11). Thus, Earl also fails to teach or suggest the above-recited limitation of Applicants' claim 26. Accordingly, claim 26 is allowable over Earl and the other art of record, whether taken singly, or in combination. Independent claim 38 includes limitations similar to those recited above for claim 26, and is allowable for the reasons set forth above under a similar rationale.

Furthermore, independent claim 31 includes the limitation that

<u>when said first program as a target to be executed is associated with said second program, said processor executes said first program and sends to said one or more devices via said network interface, an instruction for executing said second program</u> in said one or more devices, receives execution results produced by the executed second program via said network interface via the network, uses the execution results to generate a response, and sends, to said first computer, the response as a reply of said request, <u>said one or more devices and said second program remaining undisclosed to said first computer.</u>

Appl. No. 10/644,936
Reply dated October 31, 2007
Response to Office Action Mailed September 21, 2007

Docket No. NIT-391

The Office Action asserts that this limitation is taught by Earl at col. 5, lines 49-64.

Yet, as pointed out above in the discussion of claim 26, this portion of Earl merely

teaches that the browser requests data from a known URL of the website server.

and thus, the website server does not remain undisclosed. Accordingly, for the

reasons discussed above with respect to claim 26, independent claim 31 is also

allowable over Earl and the other art of record, whether taken singly, or in

combination.

<u>Discussion of New Independent Claim 41</u>

The present invention, as set forth in independent claim 41, includes that

<u>said second service-providing computer receives said second request, executes said one or more second programs upon which said first program depends</u>, and sends the execution results to said first service-providing computer <u>without disclosure to the service-utilizing computer of said second service-providing computer or said one or more second programs</u>.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 26,

31 and 38, independent claim 41 is also allowable.

Claim 41 further includes

a service-disclosing device coupled to said first service-providing computer, said second service-providing computer, and said service-utilizing computer via said network, <u>said service-disclosing device collecting relationship information regarding whether a dependent relationship hierarchy exists between said first program on said first service-providing computer and said one or more second programs on said second service-providing computer</u>.

Earl, on the other hand, only teaches that a proxy server maintains two lists of services provided by the particular proxy server and any other proxy severs located upstream from the particular proxy server in the system (col. 6, lines 12-15). The particular proxy server is able to request function lists, namely, a default function list and an authenticated function list from other proxy servers located upstream of the particular proxy server for determining which services the proxy server is able to make available to a client (see, e.g., col. 7, lines 36-67). Thus, Earl fails to teach or suggest a service-disclosing device that collects relationship information on whether a dependent relationship hierarchy exists between a first program on a first service-providing computer and one or more second programs on a second service-providing computer.

Dutta also fails to teach or suggest this feature of Applicants' claim 41. Dutta teaches a peer-to-peer data sharing network for allowing a node to indicate an alternate manner for fulfilling a download request if the node determines that its response characteristics would be inadequate if it attempted to fulfill the download request (Dutta at par. 0011). However, Dutta provides no teaching or suggestion of a service-disclosing device that collects information regarding whether a dependent relationship hierarchy exists between a first program on a first service-providing computer and one or more second programs on a second service-providing computer, as recited in Applicants' claim 41. Accordingly, this aspect of claim 41 is

18

allowable over Earl, Dutta, and the other art of record, whether taken singly, or in

combination.

> Furthermore, Applicants' new claim 41 also includes that

> when said dependent relationship exists, said service-disclosing
> device discloses said first program to said service-utilizing computer
> and does not disclose said second service-providing computer and
> said one or more second programs upon which the first program
> depends to said service-utilizing computer.

In Earl, the client knows that the proxy servers upstream from the client provide the

services on the lists provided by each proxy server (col. 8, lines 1-21). Under

Applicants' invention, when the service-disclosing device discloses available

services to the service-utilizing computer, the service-disclosing device only

discloses the first service-providing computer and the first program, and does not

does not disclose the second service-providing computer or the one or more second

programs upon which the first program depends to the service-utilizing computer.

Additionally, as discussed above, Dutta only teaches a peer-to-peer data sharing

network for allowing a node to indicate an alternate manner for fulfilling a download

request. Accordingly, claim 41 is allowable over the combination of Earl and Dutta

for this aspect as well. The remaining new claims are dependent claims and are

allowable at least because they depend from allowable base claim 41.

Appl. No. 10/644,936
Reply dated October 31, 2007
Response to Office Action Mailed September 21, 2007

Docket No. NIT-391

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Colin D. Barnitz
Registration No. 35,061

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: October 31, 2007